

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|--------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/635,478 | 08/07/2003 | Fang Liu | 3897-0109P | 1081 |
| 2292 | 7590 01/14/ | EXAM | EXAMINER | |
| | EWART KOLASO | WONG, S | TEVEN B | |
| PO BOX 747 FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747 | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | , | | 3711 | |

DATE MAILED: 01/14/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | Application No. | Applicant(s) | | |
|--|---|---|--|--|
| | 10/635,478 | LIU ET AL. | | |
| Office Action Summary | Examiner | Art Unit | | |
| | Steven Wong | 3711 | | |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication ap | pears on the cover sheet with | h the correspondence address | | |
| Period for Reply | | | | |
| A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a repl - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailin earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | I36(a). In no event, however, may a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONT on cause the application to become ABA | ply be timely filed (30) days will be considered timely. HS from the mailing date of this communication. NDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). | | |
| Status | | | | |
| 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 h | lovember 2004. | | | |
| | | | | |
| 3) Since this application is in condition for allowa | nce except for formal matte | ers, prosecution as to the merits is | | |
| closed in accordance with the practice under the | Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. | 11, 453 O.G. 213. | | |
| Disposition of Claims | | | | |
| 4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-24</u> is/are pending in the application | 1. | | | |
| 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra | | | | |
| 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. | | | | |
| 6) Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected. | · | | | |
| 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. | | | | |
| 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o | or election requirement. | | | |
| Application Papers | | | | |
| 9) The specification is objected to by the Examine | er. | | | |
| 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acc | | y the Examiner. | | |
| Applicant may not request that any objection to the | | | | |
| Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correc | tion is required if the drawing(s | s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). | | |
| 11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex | xaminer. Note the attached | Office Action or form PTO-152. | | |
| Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 | | | | |
| 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign | n priority under 35 U.S.C. & | 119(a)-(d) or (f). | | |
| a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of: | | | | |
| 1.☐ Certified copies of the priority document | ts have been received. | | | |
| 2. Certified copies of the priority document | | oplication No | | |
| 3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the prior | • | • | | |
| application from the International Burea | u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). | | | |
| * See the attached detailed Office action for a list | of the certified copies not r | eceived. | | |
| | | | | |
| Attachment(s) | _ | | | |
| 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | | Immary (PTO-413) | | |
| 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | | /Mail Date formal Patent Application (PTO-152) | | |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date | 6) Other: | | | |

Application/Control Number: 10/635,478

Art Unit: 3711

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

- 1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
 - The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
- 2. Claims 1-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In claim 1, the language "interfaces longitude lines and latitude lines" is inapt.

In claim 5, the identifier states that this claim is being currently amended, however, the amendment is not clear. It should be noted that the bracketed symbol should be lined through to indicate deletion.

In claim 17, the language "a plurality of interfaces defining along with a longitude lines and a latitude lines on a hollow globe-like body" is not clear in indicating that which is being defined.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 3. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
- 4. Claims 1-13 and 15-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gorio (5,100,359) in view of Nystad et al. (2,957,251). Note the basis for the rejections set forth in the first Office Action. Regarding claims 21-24, the pieces of Gorio are free of contact with an underlying support structure. Further, when modified by Nystad the pieces will only have four face boundaries which contact other face boundaries.

Page 3

Application/Control Number: 10/635,478

Art Unit: 3711

5. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gorio (5,100,359) in view of Nystad et al. (2,957,251) and Miller (4,494,935). Note the basis for the rejection set forth in the first Office Action.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but are not deemed to be persuasive. Applicant contends that the reference to Gorio does not teach the amended claim language. The applicant is requested to note that the rejection of claims 1 and 17 is now over the combination of Gorio in view of Nystad et al. Gorio states that other objects may be imitated by the toy. Nystad provides a globe puzzle including pieces that run along longitudinal and latitudinal lines. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to form the pieces of Gorio with a top surface having four sides in order to have the toy imitate a world globe. The interfaces between the pieces of Nystad obviously define longitudinal and latitudinal lines for his globe.

Regarding the reference to Miller, this reference is relied upon merely for its teaching that it is well known in the art of globe puzzles to provide additional layers to simulate various other terrain conditions.

Regarding newly presented claims 21 and 23, the reference to Gorio teaches for the pieces to be free of contact with an underlying support structure.

Regarding newly presented claims 22 and 24, when modified by Nystad the pieces of Gorio will only have four face boundaries which contact other face boundaries.

Conclusion

7. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Application/Control Number: 10/635,478

Art Unit: 3711

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Steven Wong whose telephone number is 571-272-4416. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 7am-3:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Greg Vidovich can be reached on 571-272-4415. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Steven Wong
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3711

SBW January 13, 2005